The Art of Christian Apologetics and Preaching: A Call to Humility, Respect, and Truth

A Arte di Apologética Cristâ i Pregaçám: Ufo Chamâ pa Humildade, Respeito i Verdade

基督教護教學與講道的藝術：對謙卑、尊重與真理的呼召

- Frank Leo 劉宗唐 משה הלוי *Φραγκίσκος Μωυσῆς Λευίτάκης*
משה לוין (לעווין)

Introduction: The Problem Before Us

Introduçám: Qui Problema na Nôsso Frente

引言：擺在我們面前的問題

There is a disease within the body of Christ that has gone largely undiagnosed—not a disease of doctrine, but a disease of *manner*. It is the posture of "I am right, and you are wrong," wielded not as a quiet confidence born of study and prayer, but as a weapon of aggression, condescension, and intellectual violence. This ailment infects both the apologist's lectern and the preacher's pulpit. It manifests whenever a Christian, in the name of defending the faith, resorts to attacking rather than presenting, to demolishing rather than building, to shouting rather than inviting.

Têm ufo doença drento di corpo di Cristo qui ninguêm nunca olâ—nôm ufo doença di doutrina, mas ufo doença di *manêra*. Sâm aquilo postura di "Iou sâm certo, i vôs sâm

errado," qui nôm vêm di estudo i oraçám co humildade, mas sâm ufo arma di agressám, orgulho i violência di cabeça. Este doença tâ infectâ tanto a mesa di apologista como o púlpito di pregadô. Tâ aparecê quando ufo cristám, na nome di defendê a fé, tâ atacâ na lugá di apresentâ, tâ destruí na lugá di construí, tâ gritâ na lugá di convidâ.

在基督的身體裡存在著一種長期未被診斷出來的疾病——不是教義上的疾病，而是態度上的疾病。那就是「我是對的，你是錯的」這種姿態，它不是出於研究與禱告而產生的安靜確信，而是被當作一種攻擊、居高臨下和知識暴力的武器來揮舞。這種病症感染了護教者的講台和傳道人的講壇。每當一位基督徒以捍衛信仰之名，訴諸攻擊而非呈現、訴諸摧毀而非建造、訴諸吶喊而非邀請時，這種病症就會顯現出來。

The Apostle Peter, the very rock upon whom Christ said He would build His church, gave us the foundational charter for all Christian apologetics: **"But in your hearts revere Christ as Lord. Always be prepared to give an answer to everyone who asks you to give the reason for the hope that you have. But do this with gentleness and respect"** (1 Peter 3:15, NIV). The Greek word used here for "answer" is *apologia*—a legal term meaning a verbal defense, a reasoned statement. It does not mean *prosecution*. It does not mean *attack*. The apologist is a defender, not an assailant. And the manner prescribed is unambiguous: *with gentleness and respect*. This is not a suggestion. It is a command.

Apóstolo Pedro, aquêle pedra na cima qui Cristo já falâ Êle lôgo construí su igreja, já dá pa nôs a carta fundamental pa tudo apologética cristâ: **"Mas na vôsso coraçám, santificâ Cristo como Sinhôr. Sempre ficâ preparado pa dá ufo resposta pa tudo gente qui priguntâ pa vôs dá a razám di esperança qui vôs têm. Mas fazê isto co mansidám i respeito"** (1 Pedro 3:15). A palavra grego qui já usâ aqui pa "resposta" sâm *apologia*—ufo termo legal qui significâ ufo defesa verbal, ufo argumento co razám. Nôm significâ *acusaçám*. Nôm significâ *ataque*. O apologista sâm ufo defensô, nôm ufo

atacante. I a manêra sâm claro-claro: *co mansidám i respeito*. Isto nôm sâm ufo sugestám. Sâm ufo mandamento.

使徒彼得——就是那位基督說要在其上建立教會的磐石——給了我們一切基督教護教學的根本綱領:「只要心裡尊主基督為聖。有人問你們心中盼望的緣由，就要常作準備，以溫柔、敬畏的心回答各人。」（彼得前書3:15，和合本）。這裡用來表示「回答」的希臘原文是*apologia*——一個法律術語，意指口頭辯護、有理有據的陳述。它不是指控訴。它不是指攻擊。護教者是辯護人，不是攻擊者。而且所規定的態度是毫不含糊的：以溫柔和敬畏。這不是一個建議，而是一條命令。

Yet how far we have strayed from this charter. How many apologists have turned the shield of faith into a battering ram? How many preachers have traded the bread of life for a sledgehammer? This essay seeks to examine these failures through Scripture and reason, calling Christian apologists and preachers back to the example of Christ and the Apostles.

然而，nôs já andâ tám longe di este carta. Quanto apologista já virâ o escudo di fé pa ufo aríete? Quanto pregadô já trocâ o pâm di vida pa ufo martelo? Este ensaio tâ buscâ examinâ estes falhas co a Escritura i razám, chamâ apologista-apologista i pregadô-pregadô cristám voltâ pa o exemplo di Cristo i di Apóstolo-Apóstolo.

然而，我們已經偏離這綱領多遠了。有多少護教者已經將信仰的盾牌變成了攻城槌？有多少傳道人已經將生命的糧換成了大錘？本文試圖以聖經和理性審視這些失敗，呼召基督教護教者和傳道人回到基督和使徒的榜樣。

The Error of the Attacking Apologetic

O Erro di Apologética qui Tâ Atacâ

攻擊型護教學的錯誤

The most widespread error in contemporary Christian apologetics is the reflexive leap into what we may call "attack mode." An apologist encounters a Muslim, a Hindu, a Buddhist, a Jew, or a Christian of a different denomination, and the first impulse is not to present and demonstrate the truth of one's own faith, but to tear down the other's. The Catholic attacks the Protestant. The Protestant attacks the Catholic. The Calvinist attacks the Arminian. The apologist who faces Islam does not begin by presenting the case for Christ; instead, he begins by listing what he believes are the errors of the Quran. The apologist who meets a Buddhist does not open by showing the beauty and logic of the Christian hope; instead, he attempts to dismantle Buddhist philosophy.

O erro más espalhado na apologética cristâ di hoze sâm aquilo salto pa aquilo qui nôs pôde chamâ "modo di ataque." Ufo apologista tâ encontrâ ufo muçulmano, ufo hindu, ufo budista, ufo judeu, ô ufo cristám di otro denominaçám, i o primêro impulso nôm sâm pa apresentâ i demonstrâ a verdade di su própria fé, mas pa destruí a di otro. O católico tâ atacâ o protestante. O protestante tâ atacâ o católico. O calvinista tâ atacâ o arminiano. O apologista qui tâ enfrentâ o Islám nôm tâ começâ co apresentâ o caso pa Cristo; na lugá disto, tâ começâ co listâ aquilo qui êle crê sâm êro-êro di Alcorám. O apologista qui tâ encontrâ ufo budista nôm tâ abrí co mostrâ a beleza i lógica di esperança cristâ; na lugá disto, tâ tentâ desmontâ a filosofia budista.

當代基督教護教學中最普遍的錯誤，就是條件反射式地跳入我們可以稱之為「攻擊模式」的狀態。一位護教者遇到一位穆斯林、一位印度教徒、一位佛教徒、一位猶太人，或一位不同宗派的基督徒，他的第一反應不是呈現和證明自己信仰的真理，而是去拆毀對方的信仰。天主教徒攻擊新教徒。新教徒攻擊天主教徒。加爾文主義者攻擊阿米念主義者。面對伊斯蘭教的護教者不是以呈現基督的論證開始，而是從列舉他所認為的古蘭經錯誤開始。遇到佛教徒的護教者不是以展示基督教盼望的美麗與邏輯開場，而是試圖拆解佛教哲學。

This is fundamentally backwards. The word *apologia* means *defense*, not *offense*. In an ancient courtroom, the *apologia* was the speech of the accused, presenting his case to the jury. He did not begin by attacking the prosecutor's character. He presented *his own* evidence. He made *his own* case. The greatest failure of the attacking apologist is that, in his zeal to prove the other party wrong, he neglects—and often entirely ignores—the task of proving his own case right. He spends so much energy demolishing the other's house that he never builds his own. And when the dust settles, his interlocutor stands in rubble but sees no shining city on a hill to which he might be drawn.

Isto sâm fundamentalmente pa trás. A palavra *apologia* significâ *defesa*, nôm *ataque*. Na ufo tribunal antigo, a *apologia* êra o discurso di aquêle qui já sêr acusado, apresentâ su caso pa o júri. Êle nôm já começâ co atacâ o caráter di acusadô. Já apresentâ *su própria* evidência. Já fazê *su próprio* caso. O más grandi fracasso di apologista qui tâ atacâ sâm qui, na su zelo pa provâ qui otro sâm errado, êle tâ negligenciâ—i muitas vezes tâ ignorâ completamente—a tarefa di provâ qui su próprio caso sâm certo. Tâ gastâ tánto energia destruí a casa di otro qui nunca tâ construí su própria. I quando o pó já assentâ, su interlocutô tâ ficâ na meio di ruínas mas nôm tâ olâ ninhum cidade brilhante na cima di monte pa donde êle pôde sêr atraído.

這在根本上是本末倒置的。*Apologia* 這個詞的意思是辯護，而非進攻。在古代的法庭上，*apologia* 是被告的陳詞，向陪審團呈述自己的案件。他不會從攻擊控方的品格開始。他呈現的是自己的證據。他陳述的是自己的論證。攻擊型護教者最大的失敗在於，他在急切地證明對方是錯的過程中，忽略了——而且常常是完全無視——證明自己的論點是對的這一任務。他花了太多精力去拆毀別人的房屋，卻從未建造自己的。當塵埃落定時，他的對話者站在廢墟中，卻看不到任何一座山上閃耀之城可以吸引他前往。

Jesus Himself taught this principle of self-examination before correction. In the Sermon on the Mount, He declared: **"Why do you look at the speck of sawdust in your brother's eye and pay no attention to the plank in your own eye? How can you**

say to your brother, 'Let me take the speck out of your eye,' when all the time there is a plank in your own eye? You hypocrite, first take the plank out of your own eye, and then you will see clearly to remove the speck from your brother's eye" (Matthew 7:3–5). While this passage speaks primarily of moral judgment, its principle extends naturally to the arena of apologetics: before you presume to dismantle the structure of another's belief, have you thoroughly, rigorously, and honestly examined and presented the structure of your own? Have you built your case so strongly that it can stand on its own merits without needing to lean on the ruins of another?

Jesus Mesmo já ensinâ este princípio di auto-exame antes di correçám. Na Sermám di Monte, Êle já declarâ: **"Porquê vôs tâ olâ pa o cisco na olho di vôsso irmám i nôm tâ prestâ atençám pa a trave na vôsso próprio olho? Como vôs pôde falâ pa vôsso irmám, 'Disá iou tirâ o cisco di vôsso olho,' quando tudo o tempo têm ufo trave na vôsso próprio olho? Hipócrita, primêro tirâ a trave di vôsso próprio olho, i entám vôs lôgo olâ claro pa tirâ o cisco di olho di vôsso irmám"** (Mateus 7:3–5). Enquanto esta passagem tâ falâ principalmente di julgamento moral, su princípio tâ estendê naturalmente pa a arena di apologética: antes di vôs presumí desmontâ a estrutura di crença di otro, vôs já examinâ i apresentâ a estrutura di vôsso própria crença co rigor i honestidade? Vôs já construí vôsso caso tám forte qui êle pôde ficâ di pé na su próprio mérito sem precisâ apoiâ na cima di ruínas di otro?

耶穌自己教導了這個在糾正他人之前先省察自己的原則。在登山寶訓中，祂宣告說：「為什麼看見你弟兄眼中有刺，卻不想自己眼中有梁木呢？你自己眼中有梁木，怎能對你弟兄說：『容我去掉你眼中的刺』呢？你這假冒為善的人！先去掉自己眼中的梁木，然後才能看得清楚，去掉你弟兄眼中的刺。」（馬太福音7:3-5）。雖然這段經文主要談論的是道德層面的論斷，但其原則自然延伸到護教學領域：在你擅自去拆解他人信仰結構之前，你是否已經徹底地、嚴謹地、誠實地審視並呈現了你自己信仰的結構？你是否已經將自己的論證建造得如此堅固，以至於它可以憑自身的優點站立，而不需要依靠他人的廢墟來支撐？

The Discipline of Using the Other Side's Sources

A Disciplina di Usâ Fonte-Fonte di Otro Lado

使用對方來源之操練

When, however, a situation arises in which an apologist must address the claims of another religion or sect—when the task genuinely requires engagement with the other side's beliefs—a critical discipline must be observed. A good apologist will always study deeply and thoroughly the other party's belief system before speaking about it. He or she will not rely on secondhand information, popular caricatures, or the summaries provided by fellow members of his own camp. He will go to the primary sources. He will read their scriptures, their scholars, their theologians.

Porém, quando ufo situaçám tâ aparecê na qual ufo apologista têm qui abordar as reivindicaçám-reivindicaçám di otro religiám ô seita—quando a tarefa genuinamente tâ requeri envolvimento co as crenças di otro lado—ufo disciplina crítica têm qui sêr observado. Ufo bôm apologista lôgo sempre estudâ fundo i completamente o sistema di crença di otro partido antes di papiâ sobre êle. Êle ô êla nôm lôgo depende di informaçám di segunda mám, caricatura-caricatura popular, ô resumo-resumo fornecido po companhêro-companhêro di su próprio campo. Êle lôgo vai pa fonte-fonte primário. Lôgo lê ilôtro-sa escritura-escritura, ilôtro-sa estudioso-estudioso, ilôtro-sa teólogo-teólogo.

然而，當一種情況出現——護教者必須回應另一個宗教或教派的主張，當任務確實需要與對方的信仰進行交涉時——必須遵守一項關鍵的操練。一位好的護教者在談論對方的信仰體系之前，必定會深入而徹底地研究它。他或她不會依賴二手資訊、流行的漫畫式描繪，或自己陣營同伴所提供的摘要。他會去查閱原始資料。他會閱讀他們的經典、他們的學者、他們的神學家。

More importantly, when engaging the other side, a good apologist will only use the other party's own sources—or at minimum, sources that the other side agrees upon and recognizes as authoritative. The reason for this is simple and logical: to the other party, the apologist's own scriptures and authorities are merely *opinions*, not established facts. If a Christian quotes the Bible to a Muslim to prove Islam wrong, the Muslim does not accept the Bible as his final authority. The verse carries no persuasive weight. It is like a defense attorney citing a law from a foreign country in a domestic courtroom—the judge will not recognize it. But if that same Christian can demonstrate a contradiction or difficulty using the Quran itself, using the Hadith, using the scholars that Muslims themselves recognize, then the argument carries genuine weight within the other side's own framework.

Más importante, quando tâ engajâ co otro lado, ufo bôm apologista lôgo usâ sómente fonte-fonte di próprio otro partido—ô pelo menos, fonte-fonte qui otro lado tâ concordâ i tâ reconhecê como autoritativo. A razám pa isto sâm simples i lógico: pa otro partido, as escritura-escritura i autoridade-autoridade di apologista sâm apenas *opiniám-opiniám*, nôm fato-fato estabelecido. Se ufo cristám tâ citâ a Bíblia pa ufo muçulmano pa provâ qui Islám sâm errado, o muçulmano nôm tâ aceitâ a Bíblia como su autoridade final. O versículo nôm tâ carregâ ninhum peso persuasivo. Sâm como ufo advogado di defesa citâ ufo lei di ufo país estrangêro na ufo tribunal doméstico—o juiz nôm lôgo reconhecê. Mas se aquêle mesmo cristám pôde demonstrâ ufo contradiçám ô dificuldade usâ o próprio Alcorám, usâ o Hadith, usâ estudioso-estudioso qui próprio muçulmano-muçulmano tâ reconhecê, entám o argumento tâ carregâ peso genuíno drento di próprio estrutura di otro lado.

更重要的是，當與對方交涉時，一位好的護教者只會使用對方自己的來源——或者至少是對方同意並承認為權威的來源。原因很簡單且合乎邏輯：對於對方而言，護教者自己的經典和權威不過是意見，而非既定事實。如果一個基督徒引用聖經來向穆斯林證明伊斯蘭教是

錯的，穆斯林並不接受聖經作為他的最終權威。那節經文不具有任何說服力。這就像一位辯護律師在國內法庭上引用外國法律——法官不會承認它。但如果同一位基督徒能夠使用古蘭經本身、使用聖訓、使用穆斯林自己承認的學者來展示矛盾或困難，那麼這個論證就在對方自己的框架內具有了真正的份量。

The Apostle Paul modeled this principle magnificently at Mars Hill in Athens. Standing before a council of Epicurean and Stoic philosophers, Paul did not begin by quoting Genesis or the Psalms—texts entirely foreign and unauthorized to his pagan audience. Instead, he began where *they* were: **"People of Athens! I see that in every way you are very religious. For as I walked around and looked carefully at your objects of worship, I even found an altar with this inscription: TO AN UNKNOWN GOD. So you are ignorant of the very thing you worship—and this is what I am going to proclaim to you"** (Acts 17:22–23). Paul studied their culture. He observed their altars. He even quoted their own poets: **"As some of your own poets have said, 'For we are also his offspring'"** (Acts 17:28). He used *their* sources to build a bridge to *his* message. He did not attack their culture; he entered it, found the seeds of truth within it, and used those seeds to lead them toward the fuller truth of Christ.

Apóstolo Paulo já modelâ este princípio magnificamente na Monte di Marte na Atenas. Ficâ di pé na frente di ufo conselho di filósofo-filósofo epicureus i estoicos, Paulo nôm já começâ co citâ Gênesis ô Salmo-Salmo—texto-texto completamente estrangêro i nôm autorizado pa su audiência pagám. Na lugá disto, já começâ undi *ilôtro* já ficâ: **"Nhôm-nhôm di Atenas! Iou tâ olâ qui na tudo manêra vôsôtro sâm bêm-di religioso. Porquê quando iou já andâ i já olâ co cuidado pa vôsôtro-sa objeto-objeto di adoraçám, iou até já encontrâ ufo altar co esta inscriçám: PA UFO DEUS DESCONHECIDO. Entám vôsôtro sâm ignorante daquilo mesmo cuza qui vôsôtro tâ adorâ—i isto sâm aquilo qui iou tâ vai proclamâ pa vôsôtro"** (Atos 17:22–23). Paulo já estudâ ilôtro-sa cultura. Já observâ ilôtro-sa altar-altar. Até já citâ

ilôtro-sa próprio poeta-poeta: **"Como algum di vôsôtro-sa próprio poeta-poeta já falâ, 'Porquê nôs também sâm su descendência'"** (Atos 17:28). Já usâ *ilôtro-sa* fonte-fonte pa construí ufo ponte pa *su* mensagem. Nôm já atacâ ilôtro-sa cultura; já entrâ drento dela, já encontrâ semente-semente di verdade drento dela, i já usâ aquêle semente-semente pa guiâ ilôtro pa mais completa verdade di Cristo.

使徒保羅在雅典的戰神山上完美地示範了這個原則。站在伊壁鳩魯派和斯多葛派哲學家的議會面前，保羅並沒有從引用創世記或詩篇開始——那些對他的異教聽眾來說完全是陌生且不具權威性的文本。相反，他從他們所在之處開始：「眾位雅典人哪，我看你們凡事很敬畏鬼神。我遊行的時候，觀看你們所敬拜的，遇見一座壇，上面寫著『未識之神』。你們所不認識而敬拜的，我現在告訴你們。」（使徒行傳17:22-23）。保羅研究了他們的文化。他觀察了他們的祭壇。他甚至引用了他們自己的詩人：「就如你們作詩的，有人說：『我們也是祂的後裔。』」（使徒行傳17:28）。他使用了他們的來源來搭建通往他的信息的橋樑。他沒有攻擊他們的文化；他進入了它，在其中找到了真理的種子，並使用那些種子引導他們走向基督更完整的真理。

This is the gold standard of apologetic engagement. Paul did not say to the Athenians, "Your poets are fools and your philosophers are blind." He said, in effect, "Your own poets have glimpsed something true—let me show you the fullness of that truth." The lesson is clear: if you must engage the other side, do them the honor of knowing their tradition better than they might expect, and use their own authorities to make your points. Anything less is intellectually dishonest, rhetorically ineffective, and, most critically, it dishonors the God of all truth.

Isto sâm o padrám di ouro di engajamento apologético. Paulo nôm já falâ pa Atenienses, "Vôsôtro-sa poeta-poeta sâm tolo i vôsôtro-sa filósofo-filósofo sâm cego." Já falâ, na efeito, "Vôsôtro-sa próprio poeta-poeta já vislumbrâ algo verdadêro—disá iou mostrâ pa vôsôtro a plenitude daquêle verdade." A liçám sâm claro: se vôs têm qui engajâ co otro lado, fazê pa ilôtro a honra di conhecê ilôtro-sa tradiçám melhô di qui

ilôtro pôde esperâ, i usâ ilôtro-sa própria autoridade-autoridade pa fazê vôsso ponto-ponto. Cualquê cuza menos qui isto sâm intelectualmente desonesto, retoricamente ineficaz, i, más criticamente, tâ desonrâ o Deus di tudo verdade.

這是護教交涉的黃金標準。保羅沒有對雅典人說：「你們的詩人是愚人，你們的哲學家是瞎子。」他實際上是說：「你們自己的詩人已經瞥見了某些真實的東西——讓我向你們展示那真理的豐盛。」教訓是明確的：如果你必須與對方交涉，就要給他們這份尊重——對他們的傳統的了解超出他們的預期，並使用他們自己的權威來闡明你的觀點。任何低於此標準的做法在知識上都是不誠實的，在修辭上都是無效的，而且最關鍵的是，它羞辱了全然真理的上帝。

The Failure of the Attacking Preacher

O Fracasso di Pregadô qui Tâ Atacâ

攻擊型傳道人的失敗

The same sickness that plagues apologetics also infects the pulpit of the gospel preacher. When a preacher encounters a non-Christian—whether a person of another faith or of no faith at all—too often the first words out of his mouth are words of condemnation: "You are wrong. Your religion is false. If you don't believe in Jesus Christ, you will go to Hell." While the preacher may believe these statements to be theologically true, the *manner* and *timing* of their delivery reveal a fundamental misunderstanding of the art of gospel proclamation.

A mesma doença qui tâ pragâ a apologética também tâ infectâ o púlpito di pregadô di evangelho. Quando ufo pregadô tâ encontrâ ufo nôm-cristám—seja ufo pessoa di otra fé ô di ninhum fé—muitas vezes, as primêra-primêra palavras di su boca sâm palavra-palavra di condenaçám: "Vôs sâm errado. Vôsso religiám sâm falso. Se vôs

nôm crê na Jesus Cristo, vôs lôgo vai pa Inferno." Enquanto o pregadô pôde crê qui estes declaraçám-declaraçám sâm teologicamente verdadêro, a *manêra* i o *tempo* di su entrega tâ revelâ ufo fundamental incompreensám di arte di proclamaçám di evangelho.

同樣困擾護教學的疾病也感染了福音傳道人的講壇。當一位傳道人遇到一位非基督徒——無論是另一信仰的人還是完全沒有信仰的人——太多時候他口中的第一句話就是定罪的話:「你是錯的。你的宗教是假的。如果你不信耶穌基督，你就會下地獄。」雖然傳道人可能認為這些陳述在神學上是正確的，但它們傳達的方式和時機暴露了他對福音宣講藝術的根本誤解。

Consider the absurdity of the approach from the non-Christian's perspective. A preacher walks up to a Hindu, a Buddhist, or a secular agnostic and says: "If you don't believe in Jesus, when you die you will end up in a place where Jesus will not be there." Let us apply simple logic: this person does not believe in Jesus. He or she has no relationship with Jesus, no personal attachment, no experienced love from Jesus. Why, then, would the absence of Jesus in the afterlife constitute a threat? The statement, meant to terrify, instead bewilders. It is as if someone said to you, "If you don't join our club, you will never get to meet our president"—a person you have never met, never known, and have no desire to know. The threat is empty because the relationship does not exist.

Considerâ o absurdo di esta abordagem di perspectiva di nôm-cristám. Ufo pregadô tâ andâ até ufo hindu, ufo budista, ô ufo agnóstico secular i tâ falâ: "Se vôs nôm crê na Jesus, quando vôs morrê vôs lôgo acabâ na ufo lugá undi Jesus nôm lôgo ficâ." Disá nôs aplicâ lógica simples: esta pessoa nôm crê na Jesus. Êle ô êla nôm têm ninhum relaçám co Jesus, ninhum ligaçám pessoal, ninhum amô experimentado di Jesus. Porquê, entám, a ausência di Jesus na vida depois di morte lôgo constituí ufo ameaça? A declaraçám, qui já sêr pretendido pa aterrorizar, na lugá disto tâ confundí. Sâm como se alguém já falâ pa vôs, "Se vôs nôm juntâ co nôsso clube, vôs nunca lôgo conhecê

nôsso presidente"—ufo pessoa qui vôs nunca já encontrâ, nunca já conhecê, i nôm têm ninhum desejo di conhecê. A ameaça sâm vazio porquê a relaçám nôm existe.

從非基督徒的角度來考量這種做法的荒謬性。一位傳道人走到一位印度教徒、佛教徒或世俗不可知論者面前說：「如果你不信耶穌，當你死的時候，你最終會到一個耶穌不在的地方。」讓我們運用簡單的邏輯：這個人不信耶穌。他或她與耶穌沒有任何關係、沒有個人連結、沒有經歷過來自耶穌的愛。那麼，耶穌在來世中的缺席為什麼會構成威脅呢？這句本意是要恐嚇人的話，反而使人困惑。這就好比有人對你說：「如果你不加入我們的俱樂部，你就永遠見不到我們的主席。」——一個你從未見過、從未認識、也無意認識的人。威脅是空洞的，因為關係並不存在。

A good preacher understands this. A good preacher does not begin with condemnation but with *invitation*. Instead of saying, "You are wrong and you will go to Hell," a wise and Christ-like preacher would say something closer to: "Would you mind if I showed you a Way to escape Hell?" Notice the difference. The first approach assumes a posture of superiority and aggression—it tells the other person what *they* are and where *they* are going. The second approach assumes a posture of service and generosity—it offers something precious without demanding that the listener first acknowledge his own wretchedness. One is a fist. The other is an open hand.

Ufo bôm pregadô tâ entendê isto. Ufo bôm pregadô nôm tâ começâ co condenaçám mas co *convite*. Na lugá di falâ, "Vôs sâm errado i vôs lôgo vai pa Inferno," ufo sábio i Cristo-como pregadô lôgo falâ algo más perto di: "Vôs importâ se iou mostrâ pa vôs ufo Caminho pa escapâ di Inferno?" Notâ a diferença. A primêra abordagem tâ assumi ufo postura di superioridade i agressám—tâ falâ pa otra pessoa qui cuza *ilôtro* sâm i pa undi *ilôtro* tâ vai. A segunda abordagem tâ assumi ufo postura di serviço i generosidade—tâ oferecê algo precioso sem exigí qui o ouvinte primêro reconhecê su própria miséria. Ufo sâm ufo punho. Otro sâm ufo mám aberta.

一位好的傳道人明白這一點。一位好的傳道人不是以定罪開始，而是以邀請開始。與其說「你是錯的，你會下地獄」，一位有智慧、效法基督的傳道人會說更接近這樣的話：「你介意我向你展示一條逃離地獄的道路嗎？」注意其中的區別。第一種方式假定了一種優越和攻擊的姿態——它告訴對方他們是什麼、他們要去哪裡。第二種方式假定了一種服務和慷慨的姿態——它提供了某些珍貴之物，而不要求聽者首先承認自己的可悲。一個是拳頭。另一個是張開的手。

This was the method of Jesus Himself. When He encountered the Samaritan woman at the well—a woman from a rival religious sect that the Jews despised—He did not open with, "Your Samaritan religion is wrong and your worship on Mount Gerizim is false." Instead, He began with a request: **"Will you give me a drink?"** (John 4:7). He entered her world. He engaged with her on her terms. And when the conversation turned to matters of worship, He spoke truth, yes—**"You Samaritans worship what you do not know; we worship what we do know, for salvation is from the Jews"** (John 4:22)—but He spoke it within the context of a relationship He had already built, a conversation He had already earned, and a tone of respectful engagement that caused her not to flee but to listen, and eventually to believe.

Este já sêr o método di próprio Jesus. Quando Êle já encontrâ a mulé samaritana na poço—ufo mulé di ufo seita religiosa rival qui judeu-judeu já desprezâ—nôm já abrí co, "Vôsso religiám samaritano sâm errado i vôsso adoraçám na Monte Gerizim sâm falso." Na lugá disto, já começâ co ufo pedido: **"Vôs lôgo dá pa lou ufo bêba?"** (Joám 4:7). Já entrâ na mundo dela. Já engajâ co êla na têrmo-têrmo dela. I quando a conversa já virâ pa assunto-assunto di adoraçám, Êle já falâ verdade, sim—**"Vôsôtro samaritano-samaritano tâ adorâ aquilo qui vôsôtro nôm sabe; nôs tâ adorâ aquilo qui nôs sabe, porquê salvaçám vêm di judeu-judeu"** (Joám 4:22)—mas já falâ isto drento di contexto di ufo relaçám qui Êle já construí, ufo conversa qui Êle já merecê, i

ufo tom di engajamento respeitoso qui já causâ êla nôm fugí mas escutâ, i finalmente crê.

這正是耶穌自己的方法。當祂在井邊遇到撒瑪利亞婦人——一個來自猶太人所鄙視的敵對宗教派別的婦人——祂沒有以「你們撒瑪利亞人的宗教是錯的，你們在基利心山的敬拜是假的」作為開場。相反，祂以一個請求開始：「請你給我水喝。」（約翰福音4:7）。祂進入了她的世界。祂以她的條件與她交流。當談話轉向敬拜的問題時，祂確實說了真理——「你們所拜的，你們不知道；我們所拜的，我們知道，因為救恩是從猶太人出來的。」（約翰福音4:22）——但祂是在已經建立了關係的背景下說的，是在已經贏得了對話機會的前提下說的，是以一種尊重的交流語氣說的，這使她沒有逃離，而是傾聽，最終相信了。

The Sin of Speaking from Ignorance

O Pecado di Papiâ di Ignorância

出於無知而發言的罪過

There is one more failure that must be addressed: the sin of speaking about other religions and sects from ignorance, opinion, guesswork, and secondhand hearsay. This is rampant among both apologists and preachers. A pastor who has never read a page of the Quran stands before his congregation and pronounces what "Muslims believe." A street evangelist who has never studied Theravada Buddhism tells a Buddhist that "your religion teaches you to worship idols." A Calvinist who has never read Arminius himself tells an Arminian congregation what "Arminians believe." These are not acts of truth-telling. They are acts of bearing false witness.

Têm ufo más fracasso qui têm qui sêr abordado: o pecado di papiâ sobre otro religiám-religiám i seita-seita di ignorância, opiniám, adivinhação, i boato di segunda mám. Isto sâm desenfreado entre tanto apologista-apologista como pregadô-pregadô.

Ufo pastô qui nunca já lê ufo página di Alcorám tâ ficâ di pé na frente di su congregaçám i tâ pronunciâ aquilo qui "muçulmano-muçulmano tâ crê." Ufo evangelista di rua qui nunca já estudâ budismo Theravada tâ falâ pa ufo budista qui "vôsso religiám tâ ensinâ vôs pa adorâ ídolo-ídolo." Ufo calvinista qui nunca já lê próprio Arminius tâ falâ pa ufo congregaçám arminiana aquilo qui "arminiano-arminiano tâ crê." Estes nôm sâm ato-ato di falâ verdade. Sâm ato-ato di dá falso testemunho.

還有一項失敗必須提出：出於無知、意見、猜測和二手傳聞來談論其他宗教和教派的罪過。這在護教者和傳道人中都十分猖獗。一位從未讀過一頁古蘭經的牧師站在他的會眾面前宣稱「穆斯林相信什麼」。一位從未研究過上座部佛教的街頭佈道者告訴一位佛教徒「你的宗教教你拜偶像」。一位從未讀過阿米念本人著作的加爾文主義者告訴阿米念主義的會眾「阿米念主義者相信什麼」。這些不是講述真理的行為。這些是作假見證的行為。

The ninth commandment declares: **"You shall not give false testimony against your neighbor"** (Exodus 20:16). To misrepresent what another person or community believes—whether through laziness, carelessness, or malice—is to bear false witness against them. It is a violation of the commandment, and it is a sin that brings reproach upon the name of Christ. When a Christian stands before a non-Christian and says things about that person's religion that are inaccurate, the non-Christian does not think, "This person is simply mistaken." The non-Christian thinks, "This person is a liar, and the religion he represents produces liars." The damage to the gospel is incalculable.

O nono mandamento tâ declarâ: **"Nôm dá falso testemunho contra vôsso vizinho"** (Êxodo 20:16). Representâ mal aquilo qui otra pessoa ô comunidade tâ crê—seja po preguiça, descuido, ô malícia—sâm dá falso testemunho contra ilôtro. Sâm ufo violaçám di mandamento, i sâm ufo pecado qui tâ trazê reproche na cima di nome di Cristo. Quando ufo cristám tâ ficâ na frente di ufo nôm-cristám i tâ falâ cuza-cuza sobre religiám daquêle pessoa qui sâm incorreto, o nôm-cristám nôm tâ pensâ, "Esta pessoa sâm simplesmente enganado." O nôm-cristám tâ pensâ, "Esta pessoa sâm ufo

mentiroso, i a religiám qui êle tâ representâ tâ produzi mentiroso-mentiroso." O dano pa evangelho sâm incalculável.

第九誡宣告:「不可作假見證陷害人。」(出埃及記20:16)。歪曲他人或其他群體的信仰——無論是出於懶惰、粗心還是惡意——就是對他們作假見證。這是違反誡命的，這是一種使基督之名蒙羞的罪。當一位基督徒站在一位非基督徒面前，說出關於那人宗教的不準確之事時，那位非基督徒不會想:「這個人只是搞錯了。」那位非基督徒會想:「這個人是個騙子，他所代表的宗教製造騙子。」對福音的損害是不可估量的。

The book of Proverbs warns us: **"The one who gives an answer before he listens—that is his folly and his shame"** (Proverbs 18:13). A preacher or apologist who speaks about another faith without having deeply listened to and studied that faith is committing this very folly. He answers before he listens. He pronounces before he understands. He condemns before he comprehends. And the shame that results falls not only upon him but upon the faith he claims to represent.

箴言書警告我們:「未曾聽完先回答的，便是他的愚昧和羞辱。」(箴言18:13)。一位在未曾深入聆聽和研究另一信仰之前就談論它的傳道人或護教者，正犯著同樣的愚昧。他還沒聽完就回答了。他還沒理解就下了定論。他還沒明白就定了罪。由此產生的羞辱不僅落在他身上，也落在他自稱代表的信仰之上。

Livro di Provérbios tâ avisâ pa nôs: **"Aquêle qui tâ dá ufo resposta antes di êle escutâ—isto sâm su loucura i su vergonha"** (Provérbios 18:13). Ufo pregadô ô apologista qui tâ papiâ sobre otra fé sem já escutâ profundamente i já estudâ aquêle fé tâ cometê esta mesma loucura. Tâ respondê antes di escutâ. Tâ pronunciâ antes di entendê. Tâ condenâ antes di compreendê. I a vergonha qui tâ resultâ nôm cai sómente na cima dele mas na cima di fé qui êle tâ reivindicâ representâ.

Conclusion: Building, Not Demolishing

Conclusám: Construí, Nôm Destruí

結論：建造，而非拆毀

Let us return to where we began. The charter of Christian apologetics is 1 Peter 3:15—a command to defend, not to attack; to answer, not to prosecute; to do so with gentleness and respect, not with arrogance and contempt. The model of Christian preaching is Christ at the well and Paul at Mars Hill—men who entered the world of the other, who studied the beliefs of the other, who used the language and sources of the other, and who offered truth as a gift rather than imposing it as a verdict.

Disá nôs voltâ pa undi nôs já começâ. A carta di apologética cristâ sâm 1 Pedro 3:15—ufo mandamento pa defendê, nôm pa atacâ; pa respondê, nôm pa acusâ; pa fazê isto co mansidám i respeito, nôm co arrogância i desprezo. O modelo di pregaçám cristâ sâm Cristo na poço i Paulo na Monte di Marte—nhôm-nhôm qui já entrâ na mundo di otro, qui já estudâ crenças di otro, qui já usâ a língu i fonte-fonte di otro, i qui já oferecê verdade como ufo presente na lugá di impô como ufo veredicto.

讓我們回到起初之處。基督教護教學的綱領是彼得前書3:15——一條要辯護而非攻擊、要回答而非控告、要以溫柔和敬畏而非以傲慢和輕蔑行之的命令。基督教講道的典範是井邊的基督和戰神山上的保羅——他們進入了他人的世界，研究了他人的信仰，使用了他人的語言和來源，將真理作為禮物奉上，而非作為判決強加。

The Christian who says "I am right and you are wrong" may indeed be right. But if his manner of saying it drives the other person further from the truth rather than closer to it, then he has failed in his mission. Being right is not enough. Being right *rightly*—with humility, with study, with respect, with gentleness, with the other person's genuine good as the goal—that is the calling. As Paul wrote to the Corinthians: **"If I speak in the**

tongues of men or of angels, but do not have love, I am only a resounding gong or a clanging cymbal" (1 Corinthians 13:1). An apologetic without love is noise. A sermon without respect is clanging metal. But truth spoken in love, defense made with gentleness, a gospel offered with an open hand—this is the sound that draws the nations to the living God.

O cristám qui tâ falâ "Iou sâm certo i vôs sâm errado" pôde de facto sêr certo. Mas se su manêra di falâ isto tâ empurrâ otra pessoa más longe di verdade na lugá di más perto, entám êle já fracassâ na su missám. Sêr certo nôm sâm bastante. Sêr certo *certamente*—co humildade, co estudo, co respeito, co mansidám, co o genuíno bêm di otra pessoa como o objetivo—isto sâm a vocaçám. Como Paulo já escrevê pa Coríntios: **"Se iou papiâ na língu-língu di nhôm-nhôm ô di anjo-anjo, mas nôm têm amô, iou sâm sómente ufo gongo qui tâ ressoâ ô ufo címbalo qui tâ retini"** (1 Coríntios 13:1). Ufo apologética sem amô sâm barulho. Ufo sermám sem respeito sâm metal qui tâ retini. Mas verdade falado na amô, defesa feito co mansidám, ufo evangelho oferecido co ufo mám aberta—isto sâm o som qui tâ atraí naçám-naçám pa o Deus vivo.

說「我是對的，你是錯的」的基督徒可能確實是對的。但如果他說這話的方式使對方離真理更遠而非更近，那麼他在使命上就失敗了。正確是不夠的。正確地正確——以謙卑、以研究、以尊重、以溫柔、以對方真正的益處為目標——這才是呼召。正如保羅寫給哥林多人的：「我若能說萬人的方言，並天使的話語，卻沒有愛，我就成了鳴的鑼、響的鈸一般。」（哥林多前書13:1）。沒有愛的護教是噪音。沒有尊重的講道是響的鈸。但在愛中說出的真理、以溫柔作出的辯護、以張開的手獻上的福音——這才是吸引萬國歸向永生上帝的聲音。

May we, as apologists and preachers, be found building bridges rather than burning them, presenting our own case rather than merely attacking the other's, studying deeply before we speak, and always—always—offering the hope that is within us with the gentleness and respect that our Lord commands.

Disá nôs, como apologista-apologista i pregadô-pregadô, sêr encontrado construí ponte-ponte na lugá di queimâ, apresentâ nôsso próprio caso na lugá di meramente atacâ di otro, estudâ profundamente antes di nôs papiâ, i sempre—sempre—oferecê a esperança qui ficâ drento di nôs co a mansidám i respeito qui nôsso Sinhôr tâ mandâ.

願我們作為護教者和傳道人，被發現是在搭建橋樑而非焚燒橋樑，是在呈現自己的論證而非僅僅攻擊對方，是在說話之前深入研究，並且始終——始終——以我們的主所命令的溫柔和敬畏，獻上在我們裡面的盼望。

Soli Deo Gloria.

Sómente pa Deus a Glória.

惟獨榮耀歸於上帝。